

1
2
3
4

5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

7
8 ROYLENE RAY, *et al.*, No. C-06-1807 JSW (EMC)
9 Plaintiffs,
10 v.
11 BLUEHIPPO FUNDING, LLC, *et al.*,
12 Defendants.

13 _____/
14
15 ORDER RE CONFERENCE CALL ON
16 SEPTEMBER 30, 2008


17 The Court held a conference call on September 30, 2008, to address a discovery dispute
18 between the parties regarding two requests for admission (“RFAs”).

19 Plaintiffs’ motion to compel with respect to RFA No. 16 is granted. The RFA has some
20 relevance to class certification and does not impose an undue burden. The response to the RFA shall
21 be served within twenty-five (25) days of the date of the conference call.

22 Plaintiffs’ motion to compel with respect to RFA No. 37 is denied. The RFA has at best
23 marginal relevance to class certification, and the burden on BlueHippo to provide a response
24 outweighs what limited probative value the discovery has.

25
26 IT IS SO ORDERED.

27
28 Dated: September 30, 2008


EDWARD M. CHEN
United States Magistrate Judge